

Vol. 14 No 4 April 1989

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J.Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,
 RATES for 1989, 10 issues (not August and September)
 SURFACE £9.50 UK, £10.50 Europe, \$(US)18.50 elsewhere
 AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.



CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.
 The editor retains copyright in the format.

Correspondence	51
from R.G.Mayer , Department of Classics, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX	
Corrigenda to <i>LCM</i> 14.2/3 (Feb./Mar.1989), 28	51
William M.Calder III (Illinois): <i>Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on the importance of Greek for England</i>	51-53
Brian Arkins (Galway): <i>Horace in Pound's Propertius</i>	53-55
Barry Baldwin (Calgary): <i>Apuleius and the Christians</i>	56
Bracht Branham (Emory U., Atlanta, GA): <i>Hellenomania</i>	56-60
<i>Martin Bernal's The Fabrication of Greece 1785-1985</i>	
Nicholas Horsfall (Rome): <i>Atticus brings home the bacon</i>	60-62
H.D.Jocelyn (Manchester): <i>Silius 13.153. An addendum</i>	62
Review: Helen King (S.Katharine's College, Liverpool Institute of Higher Education)	63-64
Page duBois, <i>Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women</i> , Chicago, U.Chi P, 1988. Pp.xv +227. ISBN 0-226-16757-7	

School Magazines (and the Editor once edited his, so that *LCM* is not his first editorial venture) used to contain a feature called 'Our contemporaries' which listed all the other School Magazines that were received by exchange. *LCM* indeed does itself receive a large number of learned periodicals by exchange, and intends in the future to give a list and offer readers the opportunity of ordering for their own use single copies of articles that they may otherwise find it hard to obtain. This preamble takes the place of the alas by now habitual apology for the late appearance of this number, which is entirely the Editor's fault: he is working on it, and nobody would be better pleased than he would if he could actually see a number into the post at the end of the month prior to that of which it bears the name. Until that happens he must throw himself on the indulgence of subscribers, and will not weary them with further apologies.

For this preamble is intended to draw their attention to a different kind of journal, possibly closer to *Omnibus* than it is to *LCM*, but none the less containing, as it says, as well as less than serious and frankly frivolous articles, serious ones, such as a long one on 'Killing Caligula' by T.P. Wiseman. Readers may have guessed that it is *Pegasus*, the journal of the Classics Society of Exeter which last year had a radical rethink. It started in 1964 simply as a house journal, but by 1967 was being noticed by the Classical Association, and has now started exchanging (Pisa and Genoa are mentioned) and, more significantly, must pay for itself, and wishes to be seen of a standard worthy of the price (£1 p.a. but please pay for 10 years, to the Business Editor of *Pegasus* at the Department, The University, EXETER EX4 4QH) it asks.

Like *LCM* it uses a computer (not, the Editor thinks, a Mac) and a laser printer, and it seems to have some of the problems that *LCM* has encountered (starting early – it first appeared once a term but academic pressure took its toll on the editors), misprints and occasional blank pages. It also contains (vol.32 [1989] p.38) a feature called *Res Gestae*, news about members of staff and ex-students, from which the Editor learned something about retirements and relocations: as that David Harvey, who is on the Editorial Committee with Professor Wiseman, took early retirement in 1987, that John Marr came to Exeter from Aberystwyth in 1988, and that Rosemary Wright moves from the same place to Reading in October 1989.

The Editor was reflecting how many distinguished persons have left the profession early as a result of the cuts – Frank Goodyear¹, George Huxley, Tony Fitton-Brown, are names known to him – and hears sorry tales of places where the teaching is virtually done by one person and a part-timer. He has before now regretted the lack of information about these matters, and in October would like, if possible, to print a list of all members of all Classics Departments in the UK and the Republic or Ireland, and would ask Heads of Department or their authorized representatives to provide him with this information if they are permitted to do so.

The Editor informed overseas readers last month that the Union, The Association of University Teachers, was operating a ban on participation in examining: this has now been modified: exams may be set and sat but not marked, but this satisfies neither the University authorities nor the Government, which is also concerned at the Union's unwillingness to countenance appraisal schemes. The former are variously talking about disciplinary action, salary cuts, the latter has already withheld a portion of the grant which on some places has led already to an embargo on filling jobs other than by NAAS appointments. All this does not make Universities particularly happy places in which to work at the moment. The Editor should perhaps make it clear that he is no longer a member of the Union, having resigned the last time there was talk of industrial action. These notes are normally 'unpolitical' but news about this is so scarce even in this country that he believes he should say something about it.

And about the Greenbank Colloquium on Classical Scholarship in English in the 19th century, information about which and booking forms should have been in the hands of subscribers and others a long time ago. But it goes ahead, from the 16th - 20th August 1989 in Mulberry Court, University Residences close to the centre of the University. There meals will be provided in Staff House, in a fine Early Victorian Square, one of the houses in which holds the Department of Classics and Archaeology. The cost will be of the order of £150, and intending participants may already book by sending a registration fee of £30 (cheques made out to the University of Liverpool) to the Editor or to the Departmental Secretary. It is hoped that proceedings will open with a paper by Professor C.O.Brink ('Brink on Brink'), Professor Ward W.Briggs of South Carolina will talk on Gildersleeve, Dr P.G.Naiditch on Housman's invective and its motivation, Professor Collard on F.A.Paley, Professor Arnott on Headlam, Professor Jocelyn on Lindsay, Dr Keavenay on Classics in Galway in the 19th century, Mr C.A.Stray on the pronunciation of Latin and Greek, Dr Rapke, from the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, on the Roman historian George Long (and the Editor hopes to talk on Sir George Cornewall Lewis and the (in)*Credibility of Early Roman History*). But offers of short discussion papers are still welcome. Proceedings will be published.

The Editor must apologize for the unconventional nature of this notice (further evidence of the pressures under which he is operating), but feels that he had better do something at once. Proper notices will be despatched when they become available (a nice euphemism for 'when he does them').

A correspondent responded to a previous set of notes with the phrase 'Only the dead don't see the gloom', from which the Editor must take comfort in the hope that it will get better.



Correspondence

from R.G.Mayer, Department of Classics, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX

28th April 1989

Dear Sir,

If it is not too late for a mere Latinist to raise his voice in the debate about the primacy for knowledge of Greek among Englishmen of the last century, may I venture to suggest that Bishop Lightfoot's mitre deserves to be cast into the ring? For Lightfoot was without doubt one of the most learned, if not the most learned, Hellenists of his generation. Born in 1828 he was educated at King Edward's School, Birmingham, whence he passed to Trinity College, Cambridge. There he was graduated Senior Classic and Chancellor's Medallist. As tutor (Jebb was among his pupils) he read extensively in classical Greek and long hoped to edit the *Oresteia* (according to Hort in the *D.N.B.*). Of course Lightfoot went on to dedicate himself above all to the Greek of St. Paul, and classicists might be inclined therefore to say that he is offside in this competition. But it was his purpose to show that Paul's Greek was Greek, not some foreign aberration, and in order to do this he had to have a complete command of the classical language. In order to illustrate his powers I would recommend a reading of his pages on the synonyms *μορφή* and *σχῆμα* in his edition of Paul's letter to the Philippians. He made a thorough study of contemporary inscriptions in order to illustrate the Greekness of Paul's Greek. (Nor was his linguistic command limited to the classical languages, since he was one of the few Englishmen of his day to be thoroughly acquainted with the Coptic dialects; see [edd.] G.R.Eden and F.C.Macdonald, *Lightfoot of Durham*, Cambridge 1932, p.119).

At any rate, I hope that his candidacy for Senior Grecian will be given some consideration by those better placed than I am to award the palm,

Yours sincerely

Roland Mayer.

Corrigenda to LCM 14.2/3 (Feb./Mar.1989), 28

In the quotation from Artemidorus the word *ᾧσπερ* was omitted before *γυναικί*, an error attributed by the author to 'your mechanical idiot' but the Editor knows the idiot was not mechanical, and no reference to an Iron Lady was intended. The accent was also omitted from the verb *τρίβειν*, and the line *sicuius) non est, Boius est: boiam terit* should have been indented. There were also a number of errors, particularly in the diacriticals, in J.N.Adams' review of Roger Wright's book, and these will be corrected in the next number.

William M. Calder III (Illinois): *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on the importance of Greek for England* LCM 14.4 (Apr.1989), 51-53

A.D.Godley (1856-1925), the Oxford 'mountaineer, scholar, and wit'¹, with Rudyard Kipling and C.L.Graves, author of *Q.Horati Flacci Carminum Liber Quintus*², on 11 November 1910, wrote on behalf of the 'Greek Defence Committee' of which he was Secretary to Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848-1931), a recent (1908) Oxford alumnus. The reason for his letter was to enlist Wilamowitz' aid in retaining Greek as a necessary subject. The crucial debate was to be 22 November and Godley sought a letter to the *Times*. 'Many of our academic voters are hesitating between their fears and their real sympathies: and what they need is an authoritative word of

¹ See especially A.D.Godley, *Reliquiae*, edited by C.R.L.Fletcher, 2 vols. (Oxford 1926) with Fletcher's introductory life and the review at *TLS* 30 December 1926. His diaries survive as BodMS Eng.misc.d.795, as reference I owe to Mr P.G.Naiditch.

² *Q.Horati Flacci Carminum Librum Quintum* a Rudyardo Kipling et Carolo Graves anglice redditum et variorum notis adornatum ad fidem codicum MSS. edidit Aluredus D.Godley (Oxford, Blackwell, 1920). I recommend as well A.D.Godley, *The Casual Ward: Academic and Other Oddments* (London 1912).

encouragement'. Wilamowitz did not write a letter to the *Times*. Rather he replied directly to Godley authorizing him to do as he wished with the letter. In a second letter, dated Oxford 24 November 1910, Godley writes³:

I have to express to you, for the Greek Committee and for myself personally, our sincere gratitude for the letter which you were kind enough to write to us: and which, acting on your permission, I caused to be printed and circulated among the Master of Arts resident in Oxford. Nothing, it was felt, could be more desirable than that members of our University should read in its original form so admirable an exposition of those higher and wider views which are too often forgotten in the heat of an animated controversy: and I have already been assured by many persons of the great pleasure which your words have given to them – words which, if I may say so, seem to me to touch the heart of the question

If every voter in 'Congregation' possessed a copy of Wilamowitz' letter, then 340 were printed. I have only seen one and the printing was not known to the compilers of the standard bibliography of Wilamowitz' works which means none was available to them in 1929. The present crisis of Greek studies in England has caused me to translate the forgotten text. The passage of over 75 years has rendered some of the great man's arguments obsolete but the nobility and endurance of others reward attention and perhaps even in our banal age may again work good.

THE TEXT

WESTEND 15 XI 1910

My keenest interest has been aroused by the careful communication concerning the present situation and the proposal for change by which in fact the position of classical studies not only at Oxford but in England generally is threatened. I thank you sincerely for it and you are right, when you assume, that I share in your concern deeply as a loyal Oxford man in the hallowed traditions of his University. But to speak publicly to an English audience seems not to befit me, a foreigner. It is a purely English matter, which of course will not fail to affect anyone who knows enough of the the past and present to consider as a calamity for the world a lowering of intellectual culture and a break with the traditions of our great forebears, even when it seems at first glance to be only concerned with Oxford. I offer, therefore, only a few words to you. You may make any use of them that you consider appropriate.

Everyone knows from history that in the 17th century the intellectual leadership of the civilized world passed to France from Italy, but that with the beginning of the 18th century England emerged superior, that the conquest of Napoleon followed first after the conquest or better outstripping of French culture by England. For so great a culture as classical French culture remains fruitful and alive for eternity; and naturally the 18th century in France continued to produce what is imperishable. Germany, however, first appeared in the 19th century alongside the two nations from which it learned. Since then there exists only an international culture to which all can contribute. None is superior; but none ought or can without penalty want to stand on its own.

Think over too what history teaches. These great transformations coincide precisely with the emphasis granted to Greek studies among these peoples; that is with the fertilization of national character through the legacy of the Hellenes. Only a rather short-sighted view could deny that here is a matter of something more than philological scholarship. If it is not immodest, I should like to ask whether the statesmen, diplomats, and colonial officials of England, whom we abroad look

³The Godley letters are Wilamowitz *Nachlass* No.448. I am indebted to Dr K.Haenl, late Director of the *Handschriftenabteilung* of the Göttingen Library for photocopies and permission to publish. I am indebted to Schwester Hildegard von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and the late Dr Wolfgang Mommsen for permission to publish letters of her father and his uncle.

upon with such high respect (I mean not only today but as far as our historical knowledge reaches) no longer suffice in their own country so that one requires for them a different education of the youth. One thing I can say in any case. I have often emphasized in my lectures that Plato and Aristotle were a vital force in the English ruling class in a way that they were with us only in the first half of the last century, that is when Prussian officialdom achieved its greatest. The reason for that, I used to say, was that the English universities nourished the elite of the nation as a whole with the immortal thoughts of Greek philosophy, while now with us only schoolboys wretchedly learn of them. Am I now to praise this only as something of the past?

International culture requires much effort from us all, because we must learn the languages of cultured peoples. Obviously we must do so more and more. Only the opinion is spreading that Greek and Latin must yield to the living languages, which offer so much that is great and beautiful. Such change is also being considered at Oxford. No matter how attractive it sounds, it is a delusion. For reading newspapers and for businessmen a correspondence to learn languages may suffice; not for the absorption into the mind of a foreign culture.

Let us reflect that all of us together possess the legacy of culture, which the centuries since the Renaissance and the Reformation have gathered for us. That places classical studies in the forefront, in the forefront all over. Only on this shared base do we really understand one another. Whether Germans or English, how, without antiquity, do we intend to understand Montaigne or Montesquieu? How does a German without the knowledge of this shared base begin with Shaftesbury or an Englishman with Lessing? The fact is that that goes for our national literature whether we are English, French or German. The encroachment on antiquity does not benefit at all the understanding of modern literatures; it benefits only the encouragement of nationalistic isolation, which everywhere is the gravest danger for mutual understanding of peoples and for peace among them.

The rich life of the present necessarily creates new demands in the field of education for all peoples as well. There is no doubt that attention must be paid to the new needs. To this belong schools, even schools of higher education, which renounce their classical foundation, which cultivate experimental and related natural sciences, technology and much else, something which can even take place in a truly scientific manner. To this are due every sort of encouragement and respect. But it is not only unjustified, it is disastrous, if one wants only to direct everything to one goal and next therefore begins to cut back the traditional then to thrust it aside because what is new all the more passionately makes its demands. I could tell of sad experiences which we have made at home and still make daily. When so great a tradition as you have at your ancient universities, is to hand, having withstood the test of so many centuries, then piety and, if that is not enough, simply prudence, should recommend not to drag the new in here, to abandon the old. Create for new needs new departments. In rivalry it will first be seen whether the old is worth giving up.

I can scarcely believe that what I have to say can be of any help at all and especially in the sense you wish. If you have second thoughts, please set this aside. Because of my gratitude and reverence towards your university I felt it my duty not to be silent, when asked to say something which I of my own accord would not have dared to say. But I do not think that I have said anything remarkable.

ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF

D. LITT. OXON.

Copyright © 1989 William M. Calder III

Ezra Pound's *Homage to Sextus Propertius*, published in 1919, has by now been accorded respectful treatment by scholars in both Classics and English (J.P. Sullivan, *Ezra Pound and Sextus Propertius* [London 1965], with text of Pound and Propertius; D. Davies, *Pound* [London 1975], 6-61; P. Brooke, *A Student's Guide to the Selected Poems of Ezra Pound* [London 1979], 151-182; A.J. Peacock in M. Korn (ed.), *Ezra Pound and History* [U. of Maine

1985], 83-98; B.Arkins, *Paideuma* [forthcoming].

Homage to Sextus Propertius functions in a number of different ways: as straight translation; as a send-up of Classical education; as a vindication of art and sexual love. Crucial to these differing modes are the very special use of language which Pound attributed – with justice – to Propertius, and a considerable vein of humour which – with equal justice – he found in the Latin poet. As Eliot saw in 1928, when he wrote of *Homage*: 'It is also a criticism of Propertius, a criticism which in a most interesting way insists upon an element of humour, of irony and mockery, in Propertius, which Mackail and other interpreters have missed. I think Pound is critically right, and that Propertius was more civilized than most of his interpreters have admitted' (T.S.Eliot, Introduction in *Ezra Pound – Selected Poems* [London 1967]. 119-20).

One example of how this element of humour is elaborated by Pound comes in section II of *Homage*, which is loosely based on Propertius 3.3. Pound inserts a reference to 'Q.H.Flaccus's book-stall' which is not in the original poem and whose significance has eluded critics. The purpose of this note is to explicate the reference to Horace and demonstrate the humour involved.

Propertius 3.3 is one of a series of poems at the beginning of the third book, published about 22/21 B.C., which deals, in a programmatic way, with the sort of poetry Propertius is intent on writing – a love-elegy as opposed to epic poems about war – and profess specific allegiance to that mentor *par excellence* of Latin poetry, Callimachus (M.Hubbard, *Propertius* [London 1974], 68-115. An allegiance owed also by Horace – as in the programmatic opening and closing *Odes* of Book I – whose collection of three books of *Odes* was published in 23 B.C. (J.V.Cody, *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics* [Brussels 1976]).

Now it is clear that in these opening poems of Book 3 (1-5) Propertius alludes constantly to Horace's collection of *Odes* 1-3 and does so, at times, in a humorous way (W.R.Nethercut, *AJP* 91 [1970], 385-407). Which gives us the reason why Pound introduces Horace into his poem. For Pound knows that Horace is important in these poems, because both he and Propertius derive from Callimachus, and that Propertian wit is at work in the allusions to Horace.

Consequently, it is appropriate that there should be explicit mention of Horace and that it should be of witty type. As indeed it is:

I had rehearsed the Curian brothers, and made remarks on
the Horatian javelin

(Near Q.H.Flaccus's book-stall).

Propertius/Pound is, ill-advisedly, attempting epic themes, until shown the folly of this by Apollo. These themes include the battle for supremacy between the three Curiatii of Alba and the three Horatii of Rome (Livy 1.24-26), so that the phrase 'the Horatian javelin' obviously symbolizes epic poetry about war of the type deplored by Callimachus in the prologue to the *Aitia*. But the name Horatius immediately suggests a very different holder of that *nomen*, the poet Horace, who is granted a book-stall which doubtless contained the works of Callimachus, Propertius, and himself, and so one whose contents – short poems, often about sexual love – are in marked contrast to the material just mentioned.

So Callimachean poetry as practised by both Propertius and Horace is endorsed by Pound through the mechanism to making explicit mention of Horace and humorously contrasting his poetry with anti-Callimachean verse. Consequently, the assertion by Brooker (op. cit. 165) that Pound's 'point is the denigratory comparison of Horace with his glorious namesake' is incorrect. The actual result is that the literary allusions and humour of Propertius receive new life in Pound. Which is part of the homage.

Some time ago, seeking an affirmative settlement to the perennial question of her Christianity, I published a discussion ('Apuleius, Tacitus and Christians', *Emerita* 52 [1984], 1-3) of Apuleius' description of the baker's wife at *Met.* 9.14, pointing to the linguistic concordance between this passage and both Tacitus, *An.* 15.44, and Fronto, fr.10 Van den Hout = Haines 2.282; these were given prominence at the expense of the notion, common in some quarters¹ that Apuleius himself had actually read such Christian texts as 1 *Cor.* 5.11. At that time, like all other writers on the matter, I did not notice another possibly, and, if so, intriguingly, relevant text, namely the *Martyrdom of SS. Ptolemaeus and Lucius*, in the collection now conveniently known as the *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. H. Musurillo (Oxford 1972), no.3.

In this text, there is a Christian lady who leaves and divorces her immoral husband. Prior to conversion, she has shared his vices, being one who *ἡ πάλα μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ τῶν μισθοφόρων εἰχερώς ἔπραττε, μέθαις χαίρουσα καὶ κακία πάσῃ*. There can obviously be no direct linguistic concordances between this Greek and Apuleius' Latin. But style and content are very similar to each other. Moreover, the resemblance extends a little further. The Christian lady divorces her husband for his sins, he plots and gains vengeance, albeit against her religious instructor rather than herself. In Apuleius (*Met.* 9.29-30), the husband divorces the wife for her immorality, only to fall victim to her supernatural revenge.

The Roman official involved in this case of Ptolemaeus and Lucius (another self-confessed Christian) happens to be the city prefect Q. Lollius Urbicus. Not only was he of African origins but may also have been proconsul of that province and seems² (in some capacity) to have been present at Sabrata during the trial of Apuleius which took place in 158/9. The martyrdoms in question, celebrated in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2.2 and transcribed therefrom at Eusebius, *HE.* 4.17, occurred some time during the reign of Antoninus Pius.

I am not of course envisaging an Apuleius who pored over court reports of Christian trials in order to extract material for his fictions. But the interest in exotic religions manifest in his *Metamorphoses* might betoken a greater interest in the cult than pagans of his age usually felt. Christianity was growing in the Africa of his lifetime; indeed, the *Acts of the Martyrs of Scilli* (Musurillo no.6) on July 17, 180, constitute the earliest dated document from the Latin church and comport the first-ever mention of a Latin Bible (Musurillo xxii; cf. A.R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* [London 1966], 329). Apuleius might have attended such a trial from more than morbid or idle interest; alternatively, he could have talked with someone who had, perhaps even a presiding official such as Urbicus himself.

Taking *Met.* 9.14 to be a definite reference to Christianity, as both my previous and present enquiries converge in suggesting, the passage might thereby furnish a small clue for the *Metamorphoses* as a relatively late work (160 or thereafter) of Apuleius³. The present matter also serves to remind us of the usefulness of Christian texts in the understanding of secular Roman literature, a role that they still all too rarely play⁴.

Copyright © 1989 Barry Baldwin.

¹ M. Simon, 'Apulée et le christianisme', *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974), 299-305; cf. J.G. Giffiths, both in his commentary on Book XI of the *Metamorphoses* (Leiden 1975), 345, 359, and his 'Isis in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius' in *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen 1978), 153.

² The notion of H.E. Butler & A.S. Owen in their commentary (Oxford 1914) on the *Apology*, 8-9. For the career of Q. Lollius Urbicus, see *PIR*² L 327, also E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1980), 13-14; exact details and chronology of his prefecture are uncertain and controversial.

³ See most recently P.G. Walsh in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Vol. 22, Latin Literature*, pt. 5 in the paperback fascicle edition (Cambridge 1983), 96.

⁴ Albeit the notion of the influence on Christian texts has attracted somewhat more attention. See, e.g., H.B. Rosen, 'Motifs and *topoi* from the New Comedy in the New Testament', *Ancient Society* 3, (1972), 245-58; S.P. & M.J. Schiering, 'The influence of the Ancient Romances on Acts of the Apostles', *Class. Bull.* 54 (1978), 81-8, including some Apuleian material.

Bracht Branham (Emory U., Atlanta, GA): *Hellenomania...* LCM 14.4 (Apr.1989), 56-60
 Martin Bernal's *The Fabrication of Greece* 1785-1985

Practially every era of Western civilization has at one time or another tried to liberate itself from the Greeks, in deep disssatisfaction because what-ever they themselves achieved, seemingly quite original and sincerely admired, lost colour and life when held against the Greek model and shrank to a botched copy, a caricature. Time and again a hearty anger has been felt against that presumptuous little nation which had the nerve to brand, for all times, whatever was not created on its own soil as 'barbaric'. Who are these people, whose historical splendor was ephemeral, their institutions ridiculously narrow, their mores dubious and sometimes objectionable, who yet pretend to the special place among the nations which genius claims among the crowd? None of the later detractors was fortunate enough to find the cup of hemlock with which such a being could be disposed of once and for all: all the poisons of envy, slander and rage have proved insufficient to destroy that complacent magnificence. And so people have continued to be both ashamed and fearful of the Greeks – though now and again someone has come along who has acknowledged the full truth: that the Greeks are the chariot drivers of every subsequent culture.

Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872)

To ascribe predicates to a people is always dangerous; in the end, everything is so mixed that a unity develops only late, through the language – or an illusion of unity.

Nietzsche, *Notes* (1873)

Nietzsche's characteristically insightful and hyperbolic rumination on the identity of the Greeks in *The Birth of Tragedy* poses the question which Martin Bernal attempts to answer – who were the Greeks? – but does so from a perspective that Bernal would call an example of 'Hellenomania' – his term for that peculiar fascination inspired by the Greeks among northern Europeans from Winckelmann, Schiller, Hegel and Marx to Byron, Shelley and the early modernists. While Bernal would certainly not wish to deny Nietzsche's assertion of the enormous influence of the Greeks on later European culture, he rejects the idea shared by all these writers with Nietzsche that there was something categorically different about the Greeks; accordingly, he sees them less as chariot drivers than as a screen on which later societies have projected their own culture myths. In order to make this case, Bernal must give a fresh answer to Nietzsche's deceptively simple question and, in effect, generate his own rival myth of Greece and its place in Western culture.

There are innumerable ways one might seek to identify the Greeks from the available evidence, but Bernal chooses to concentrate exclusively on the question of origins: 'Who were the Greeks?' is taken to mean 'Where did they come from? What peoples generated them?'. If asked these questions by an inquisitive student, most classicists would, I think, gladly sidestep the difficult issues they raise, as R.J. Hopper does in his lucid account, *The Early Greeks*: "The term 'Greek' is not particularly adequate, less so than, for instance, 'Cretan'. It should of course be 'Greek-speakers' since ultimately the language identifies these people and their basic culture in a somewhat rough and ready way, for want of something better" (26). This linguistic approach allows us to bypass thorny questions of ethnic and cultural identity; the problem is that language is not a sufficient criterion for identifying a culture, let alone a

nation or ethnos.

Not content with this rather circular answer, Bernal pursues the question of identity by re-assessing the full assortment of ancient evidence – linguistic, literary and archaeological – and by providing an historical critique of the ideological origins of the most influential answers offered in the past. This Herculean task has taken the form of a three volume study *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*; the first volume *The Fabrication of Greece 1785-1985* (Rutgers U P. 1987; 575pp.[In UK Free Association Books, 26 Freegrove R, London N7 9RQ] is primarily concerned with the history and criticism of earlier theories of the original Greeks, particularly those theories dominant in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which were, says Bernal, 'conceived in sin' (62) – the sin of racism. Bernal's positive thesis, which emphasizes the debt of classical Greek civilization to West Semitic and Egyptian cultures, will be further developed in two forthcoming volumes (*Greece: European or Levantine? The Egyptian and West Semitic Components of Greek Civilization* and *Solving the Riddle of the Sphinx and other Studies in Egypto-Greek Mythology*). If his interpretation prevails, Bernal claims that it will require nothing less than a re-examination of 'the fundamental bases of "Western Civilization"' (2).

The argument of *The Fabrication of Greece 1785-1985* is that ancient tradition consistently represents Greek culture as the direct descendant of the older civilizations to the South and East, such as Egypt and Phoenicia (the Ancient Model) and that, in spite of the essential truth of this tradition, it was discarded in the early nineteenth century in favor of a racially inspired theory that made Indo-European invasions from the North the key event in the genesis of classical civilization (the Aryan Model). Bernal insists that the displacement of the Ancient Model was motivated by 'externalist' reasons – by ideology rather than scholarship – and exemplifies the deleterious effects of racism and 'continental chauvinism' on 'all our historiography'(2)¹. To counter this tendency he advocates a return to the Ancient Model in a modified form (the Revised Ancient Model). His revisionary model departs from ancient tradition in accepting the hypothesis of invasions or infiltrations by Indo-Europeans from the North during the third and fourth millennia and in moving the period of colonization by Egyptians and Phoenicians back to ca. 1720 B.C. from a traditional date of ca. 1500 B.C.. Thus, Bernal shifts the emphasis from hypothetical invasions from the North to legendary colonies from the South. The purpose of his contrasting models is to clarify the terms in which the question of cultural identity is posed: should classical civilization be seen primarily as an offshoot of the much older cultures to the South and East, or as fundamentally transformed by the arrival of Indo-Europeans from the North, that is, Levantine or European?

But is this choice a real one? After all, the Revised Ancient Model proposed by Bernal combines both hypotheses – of migrations from the North and colonies from the South – and he concedes that the two models are 'not necessarily mutually exclusive' (130). It is also clear that this mixed model is not, in general, as radically new as Bernal sometimes seems to suggest. As he points out, in the last forty years such influential scholars as Emily Vermeule have readily acknowledged the fundamental importance to Mycenaean civilization of 'invigorating contacts with Crete and the East' (410). Similarly, some of the most credible elements in Bernal's account were articulated by Chester Starr in *The Origins of Greek Civilization* (New York 1961), in which he denounces the 'insidious influence' of the idea that Hellenic civilization is a product of 'the Indogermanic nation'. Like Bernal, Starr traces this

¹ Bernal distinguishes between the displacement of the Ancient Model by K.O.Müller, which he believes was ideologically motivated, and the erection of the new hypothesis of an Indo-European conquest from the North by E.Curtius (The Aryan Model), which was needed to explain the recently discovered Indo-European basis of Greek (318). It seems clear, however, that the linguistic basis of the Indo-European theory would have been a serious obstacle to anyone who wished to retain the Ancient Model on scholarly grounds. In other words, if Müller had never written, there would have been good 'internalist' or scholarly grounds for questioning the adequacy of the Ancient Model.

racist theory to the influential work of the early nineteenth century German scholar K.O. Müller. Starr also acknowledges important links between Aegean civilization and the Orient. To speak of a paradigm shift in this context, as Bernal does in his preface, seems to overstate the originality of his thesis². What makes Bernal's interpretation original is not the idea that the civilizations of Egypt and the Near East were important to the development of Greek culture – many others have recognized this – but his insistence that classical Greek culture (ca. 800 B.C. – ca. 300 C.E.) can and should be seen as, in a fundamental sense, rooted in the Egyptian and Semitic cultures of the second millennium. This stronger thesis is more problematic for a variety of reasons, as we shall see.

Much of the *Fabrication of Greece* is devoted to the ideological critique of scholars such as Müller who helped to develop and propagate the Aryan model. How justified is Bernal's charge that generations of scholarly work was distorted, consciously or otherwise, by racist myths? If we take the well known English historian J.B. Bury as a test case – he wrote his widely used *A History of Ancient Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great* when the Aryan Model is said to have been at its height (1890-1930) – we find that he is clearly under the influence of racist theories, although he rejects some of the most extreme formulations. Alongside some gratuitous racial speculation, such as the dogmatic denial of any possibility of 'Semitic blood' in the population of Greece (70; 1913 edn.), we find a rejection of the Romantic idea of Greek racial purity and the myth of the Aryan nations (6). The basic elements of the revised model are acknowledged by Bury – invasions from the North, colonies from the South and East but he is clearly uncomfortable with the implications of the latter. Convinced as he is that the 'Greeks' have their roots somewhere in the Indo-European North, he is reduced to a theory of cultural amnesia when considering Greek legends that connect the Hellenes with Egypt, Phoenicia, Phrygia and Colchis 'in curious contrast with the exclusive pride which drew a hard and fast line between Greek and barbarian' (75). He concludes: 'The true home of the Greeks before they won dominion in Greece has passed clean out of their remembrance and they looked to the East, not to the North as the quarter from which some of their ancestors had migrated' (75). The idea of the 'Greeks' pre-existing Greece and swooping down from the North 'to win dominion' over Mediterranean peoples is essentially mythical.

Contemporary reluctance to entertain racial, genetic or biological explanations of cultural difference is an understandable and salubrious reaction to the politics of racism in the twentieth century. After the Holocaust it is difficult to imagine the ease with which racial myths were once accepted and applied in scholarly contexts. I still remember my own surprise at finding the learned Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) write so confidently of the strictly mercantile nature of ancient Phoenician civilization, a view which Bury formulates more succinctly: 'born merchants like the Jews'. One would have thought the Greeks had acquired an abacus not an alphabet from them. The concept of race can probably not be made precise enough to have any explanatory value, and, even if it could, the nature of the evidence it would be applied to in ancient history or prehistory would inevitably lead to new mythologies. If *The Fabrication of Greece* served only to remind us that the exclusion of race as a tool of thought is not only recent, but also runs directly counter to some of the intellectual traditions that gave rise to Classical, Near Eastern and Oriental Studies, it would be a worthwhile book. Bernal shows that the construction of mythological genealogies for the civilization of Europe from the ancient Indo-European and Semitic Ur-cultures has a long and complex history

² The recognition of racist tendencies in our thinking about the Greeks is far from new. W.R. Inge opens his article 'on Religion in *The Legacy of Greece* (Oxford 1921) by denouncing 'a heresy which is very rife just now – the theory of racialism'. He proceeds to reject the 'false and mischievous doctrine of superior and inferior races' and emphasizes instead the category of culture. When he further argues that we should not 'even regard the Greeks as a homogenous mixed race, the Spartiates were almost pure Nordics, the Athenians almost pure Mediterranean' (25) it becomes clear how pervasive racial categories remained.

closely tied to the decline of Christianity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and to the rise of the secular study of antiquity that came in the wake of the French Revolution. His account of the shifting images of Jews, Greeks, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Indian and Chinese in Europe's struggle for cultural self-definition from the Renaissance to the twentieth century is the most interesting part of the book. Traditions which may now seem marginal or exotic, such as Hermeticism, Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, emerge in this narrative as culturally and politically potent movements. In the process of telling this story, Bernal reveals as much about the peculiar pre-occupations of modern European culture as he does about the genealogy of the Greeks or the origins of Classics as a discipline.

Given the scope of this interpretation and the diverse and often recalcitrant nature of the evidence available, Bernal's argument inevitably raises many methodological questions. I will single out only three aspects of his approach that seem particularly questionable: his application of the concept of model, his use of myth as evidence, and his implicit conception of influence. The notion of an 'Ancient Model' includes sources as various as Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, the narrative frame of Plato's *Timaeus* and *Critias*, and the views of the church fathers on the origins of 'pagan' philosophy. Each of these sources poses a different set of interpretative problems; at best they are dubious sources for the history of the second millennium B.C., which is Bernal's focus. The application of a model is meant to simplify evidence, but at what point does it begin to oversimplify? Clearly related to this use of evidence is the conception of myth as coded history from which a literal narrative can be successfully extracted, an idea that has often led to contradictory conclusions in the past. When oral or mythic traditions (such as those Aeschylus draws on in the *Suppliants*) can be checked, they have often turned out to be largely if not essentially fictitious. The historical referent of the Trojan cycle is still contested and reasonably so. As M.I. Finley observes: 'The "events" in the whole of Aegean pre-history can be counted on one's fingers; they are known only from very much later myths and traditions, and . . . are extremely problematic'. Finally there is the concept of influence, obviously central to an attempt to prove the decisive impact of 'foreign' cultures on Greek civilization. While Bernal does not actually examine the concept of influence, much of the time he is evidently operating with the old billiard ball model, which treats the object of influence as a passive recipient. Yet cultural reception rarely operates mechanically; the receiving culture is at least as actively engaged in interpretation, evaluation and adaptation as the donor culture is in the production and dissemination of its cultural wares.

Originary myths often seem to hypnotize their creators – as if, if we knew where something came from, we would know in some fundamental sense what it is. This is part of the attraction of Classics. And this is the biggest problem with *Black Athena*: the simple assumption that 'Greek' culture was 'formed' (18) in the second millennium and that some single recognizable ingredient – native Mediterranean culture, Oriental civilizations, or Indo-European invasions – can be seen to have been decisive, to have carried the essence or seeds of later creativity. In the end Bernal's argument seems almost to re-validate the mythical ways of thinking it begins by calling into question. Does classical civilization have the kind of identity that can be disclosed by a more accurate model of its pre-historic past? We need to beware of what Pierre Vidal-Naquet has called the 'organicism illusion' that consists 'of treating civilization as if it were an unchanging essence . . . as if the bands of Indo-Europeans who arrived around 2200-2100 B.C. in the peninsula that was to become Hellas . . . already possessed in embryo the qualities that would permit the existence of Homer or Aristotle' (*The Black Hunter* [Baltimore 1986], 1). This way of reasoning is no less fallacious if we substitute Egyptians or Phoenicians for Indo-Europeans.

This is not to deny that the peculiar dynamism of classical Greek culture has something to do with its geographical location in which the older cultures of Africa and Asia were periodically brought into contact with the younger, more inchoate cultures that came in waves or particles from the North. Indeed, it may be precisely this unstable amalgam of old

and new that created a category not easily explicable in terms of its antecedents from North or South. Bernal would probably consider this just another way to privilege Greek culture. But the emphasis on the continuity between Greek and neighbouring cultures, while illuminating in many ways, does not address the cultural difference that made the Greeks subject to the peculiar kind of mythologizing Bernal has traced.

Some classicists may be disinclined to take seriously a Professor of Government Studies, trained in Chinese history, who thinks the fourth play of a tetralogy a 'satirical play', Neo-Platonism 'a pagan descendant of Egyptian religion' and 'xenophobic' an adequate characterization of the ideology of Aeschylus' *Persians*. This would be a mistake. While any attempt to re-write the history of the West is going to excite disagreement, Bernal has made a provocative and imaginative attempt to re-think some of the most difficult questions in the prehistory of classical civilization. Anyone interested in the origins of Western culture of the classical tradition in Europe will find *The Fabrication of Greece* fascinating. If there is something missing from *Black Athena* it is not learning; it is some sense of why the Greeks have elicited so much attention from such varied minds. It is the discovery, instigated by the 'Hellenomaniacs' that if there was something categorically different about the Greeks, this difference was a matter of historical experience – of art, literature, philosophy, politics and economics – not of origins.

Copyright © 1989 Bracht Branham.

Nicholas Horsfall (Rome): *Atticus brings home the bacon*

LCM 14.4 (Apr.1989), 60-62

I am most grateful to Dr M.Mantziou for an invitation to fly this kite at Ioannina and for translating, nobly, my paper into modern Greek; further, she and Dr M.Paschalis looked after me most generously (whereas Atticus was a notably careful host). Tony Cubberley and Lisa Fentress gave additional help in an unfamiliar field.

There is nothing exciting or unfamiliar in the observation that numerous Romans in the late Republic, and notably T.Pomponius Atticus, saw Epirote farmland as a particularly attractive area of investment, though the assertion lies close to vigorous debate, even of real scholarly uncertainty:

(i) the date of Atticus' first investment in Epirote land. 68, based on *Att.*1.5.7, may not be quite early enough; the dramatic date of *Varr. RR.*2.2.2. is 67 and there Atticus is already treated as a respected landowner. Drumann-Groebe 52.14 (but cf. *ib.* 65) give 69. Cf. further A.H.Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus*, diss. Bryn Mawr 1920, 2ff., Shackleton Bailey, ed. *Cic. Att.*1.4.

(ii) The fiercely-discussed issue of whether landed property was the real foundation of Atticus' wealth, as *Nep. Att.*14.3 asserts. Some recent discussion sheds more heat than light; landed property was in truth one large element in a well-balanced 'investment portfolio'; and it is a good deal clearer since John D'Arms' *Commerce and Social Standing* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981) why authors (e.g. *Nepos, supra*) are so inevitably disposed to mis-state the facts. Cf. further (e.g.) P.A.Brunt in Robin Seager (ed.), *Crisis of the Roman Republic* (Cambridge 1969), 94, P.D.A.Garnsey in M.I.Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property* (Cambridge 1976), 125. Individual landowners in Epirus are listed by J.Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, *BEFRA* 115 (1919), 62f.; cf. E.Gabba & M.Pasquinucci, *Strutture agrarie* (Pisa 1979), 112. Checking of the names in the prosopography of Nicolet's *Ordre Equestre* (*BEFRA* 207.2 [1974]) reveals no interesting patterns.

(iii) The extent to which Varro, *RR* 2, can be used as evidence in detail for the types of agriculture favoured by Roman landowners in Epirus; in the case of Scrofa on pigs (2.4.1) or Vaccius on cattle (2.5.2) we cannot determine the boundaries of jest and realism (cf.

R.Martin, *Recherches sur les agronomes Latins* [Paris 1971], 218).

(iv) The extent to which the 'Buthrotum affair' and the establishment of a colony of Caesarian veterans upset the pattern of landholding which had prevailed over the previous twenty years; cf. Drumann 52.48ff., Shackleton Bailey ed. *Cic.Att.*1.54f., Byrne 12.

(v) Our inability to explain Strabo's grim picture of agricultural depression (7.322) in Epirus not long after (cf. J.A.O.Larsen, *ESAR* 4.468f.).

(vi) A degree of uncertainty over the precise products which made investment in Epirote land appear so very attractive; the ample material has been collected repeatedly (Larsen l.c., N.G.L.Hammond, *Epirus* [Oxford 1967], 40ff., M.I.Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 2.1164, 3.1610, P.Cabanes, *L'Epire de la mort de Pyrrhos* . . . [Paris 1976], 491), but the military narratives to which I shall come shortly lay far more emphasis on grain.

And lastly (vii) our difficulties in establishing precisely where in Epirus Roman holdings were situated; cf. L.Robert, *Hellenica* 1 (1940), 100ff. for an attempt to localise Atticus' property in 'Pergamis and Maledos' (Varr. *RR.*2.2.1); for other holdings, cf. Drumann 52.65f., Byrne 3f.; and cf. further O.Skutsch, *LCM* 3.9 (Oct.1978), 262 & N.G.L.Hammond, *JRS* 56 (1966), 52 n.38.

It would be easy – and tempting – to enlarge upon one or several of these problems, but the central fact of Roman holdings remains undisturbed; some further light may be shed, I hope, by the publication (OUP) of my historical commentary on *Nep.Att.* and by that of Dr Ann Marshall's Harvard PhD dissertation on Atticus, some chapters of which she most generously made available to me. I am however here concerned with an issue which has attracted virtually no attention; I am most grateful to Nicholas Purcell for discussion and for the gift of proofs of his article 'The Nicopolitan Synoecism and Roman Urban Policy' to appear in *Proceedings of the first international symposium on Nicopolis, 1984*. It seems inescapable that Epirus, scantily populated and famed for the excellence of its livestock, notably cattle, will normally have produced an abundant surplus and I should like to suggest a new pattern of explanation for what may have to be done to turn it to profit, at least in the late Republic. There are three obvious possibilities; (i) export to Italy directly across the Adriatic (cf. Cabanes 493); (ii) coastal trade; cf. for the moment, Cabanes 495f., Hammond 38; the topic is most illuminatingly discussed by Purcell; (iii) livestock may also be driven on the hoof to a purchaser, though the risk of weight-loss en route should not be forgotten (despite all the experience acquired during transhumance, Pasquinucci 112ff.), and the land-routes out of Epirus are neither short nor easy (Hammond 34). Cf. F.Braudel, *The Mediterranean* 1 (London 1972), 198f., 286.

It has been noted (Hammond 42, Cabanes 493) that Epirus already in the second century has the potential to feed Roman armies (198: Plut. *Flam.*5.1; 169: Liv.44.16.2). The evidence is notably suggestive for Caesar's campaign against Pompey: *BC.*3.16.1 he visits Buthrotum to acquire corn; 3.42.3 he despairs of supplies from Italy, and sends two officers to Buthrotum to acquire corn and to establish granaries; 3.47.6 the hungry Caesarian besiegers of Dyrrachium are reduced to barley and *legumina*, but have a *summa . . . ex Epiro copia* of beef, driven north, or brought by sea, or conceivably even salted (Anthimus 12, Veget. *Mil.*4.7, J.André, *L'alimentation* [Paris 1961], 145), which they greatly esteemed, *magno in honore habebant*. Their yoghurt (cf. Hammond l.c.), milk treated with a root called *chara* (Caes. *BC* 3.48.1), is presumably made likewise from Epirote milk. This was an exceptional campaign, with unusual supply problems, and it does clearly show Epirus as essential to Caesar's commissariat. If the date of (?)69 is about right for the beginnings of Atticus' investments in land there, it is worth recalling that Pompey has just taken Jerusalem, that Armenia is hostile and that Rome is at war with Mithridates; Atticus' uncle, the usurer Caecilius, was a particular friend of Lucullus (VM 7.8.5). The Via Egnatia will have been under heavy and constant use.

The armies were fed (and here R.W.Davies' studies are fundamental and engrossing: *ANRW* 2.1.318ff., *Britannia* 2 [1971], 122ff.) by the soldiers' private purchases,

by requisition and compulsory purchase and by contracts for bulk supplies. *lanii, pecuarii* and *custodes vivarii* followed the troops (*ILS* 2091, 3265, *Dig.* 50.6.7.6), suggesting that it was perhaps not uncommon for livestock to follow the troops. Curers of meat and makers of cheese are not attested, but the traditional army diet is laid down as cured bacon, cheese and *posca* (vinegar and water): *SHA* Hadr.10.2 (confirmed by *Veg.* 4.7; not only pork was to be preserved). The cheese Epirus could supply in any quantity and it is clear from Caesar, cited above, that troops fed on Epirote beef did not much miss salt pork. From Buthrotum to Epidamnus both land and inshore routes are available and I suggest that huge profits were to be made by Epirote landowners able to supply that legions marching along the Via Egnatia, not least by a man such as Atticus, friend of Pompey, Caesar, Brutus, Antony, Agrippa and Octavian: he is not a credible victim of regular requisition or expropriation by hungry commanders. In 48, the evidence cited suggests that Caesar may have profited a good deal more than Pompey from Epirote supplies, though Atticus also (*Nep. Att.* 7.1) assisted individuals going to join Pompey, characteristically. In 43, Brutus in Epirus received welcome funds from Atticus (*Nep. Att.* 8.6): if we may judge from his excellent relations with Atticus, he will hardly have had supply problems during his highly successful campaign between Dyrrachium and Apollonia (M.L. Clarke, *The Noblest Roman* [London 1981], 51; T. Rice Holmes, *Architect of the Roman Empire* 1 [Oxford 1928], 45). And it is an attractive possibility that Agrippa's strategy in the Actium campaign is in part governed by similar factors: clearly he had no supply problems, and equally clearly Antony did, especially after Agrippa's early moves to cut his communications (Rice Holmes 1.147ff. has still all the necessary details). Agrippa held Epirus, unchallenged, at his rear and he was, after all, the son-in-law of the very recently deceased Atticus: it can hardly have been difficult or unprofitable for him to arrange Octavian's commissariat. Huge army supply contracts may therefore, I suggest, be the simplest explanation for twenty, or thirty years of Roman investment in Epirus.

Copyright © 1989 Nicholas Horsfall

H.D. Jocelyn (Manchester): *Silius 13.153. An addendum*

LCM 14.4 (Apr.1989) 62

At LCM 13.9/10 (Nov./Dec. 1988), 133, I pointed out that Silius' *postquam uox attigit aures* (13.153) had several companions in extant imperial Latin poetry (Ovid, *Pont.* 4.9.125, Germanicus 37, Juvenal 10.340-410), and need not be thought, despite Plautus, *Poen.* 1375-6, *Rud.* 233, Varro, frg. Non.p.263, Cicero, *Att.* 13.47, to have had any direct link with Republican tragedy. The absence of the verbal prefix is of no moment. Neither is the substitution of another prefix. Dr Peter Flury kindly draws my attention to the article on *auris* in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, II, fasc.7 (1904), 1511, 26-31. Here the passage of Silius and my three imperial parallels are listed, and in addition Lucretius 1.643-4 *ueraque constituunt quae belle tangere possunt | aures*, Ovid, *Epist.* 3.59 *quod scelus ut pauidas miserae mihi contigit aures*, *Met.* 1.211 (not 1.21) *contigerat nostras infamia temporis aures*, 15.497-9 *fando aliquem Hippolytum uestras puto contigit aures | ... occubuisse neci*, Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 3.38-9 *si quid mandare iuuabit, | sedulus iratae contingam nuntius aures*. The special language created by the early Republicans lived on in the late first century among poets who never read anything written before the time of Augustus.

The absence of any examples of *attingere aures* aut sim. from imperial prose establishes the high poetic tone of the locution. We may contrast *accidere ad aures* and *peruenire ad aures*, both of which are recorded in all kinds of prose as well as of verse (*ThLL* II 1512.72-1513.9, 1513.38-50). It is easy to forget how essential negative data are to the proper consideration of any question of verbal style. Here a systematically established collection will usually prove more helpful than the observations and intuitions of an individual scholar.

Copyright © 1989 H.D. Jocelyn.

Review **Helen King** (S.Katharine's College, Liverpool Institute
of Higher Education)

LCM 14.4 (Apr.1989), 63-64

Page duBois, *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*, Chicago, U.Chi P, 1988. Pp.xv +227. ISBN 0-226-16757-7

This book is billed as 'a radically new examination of women in classical Greece', self-aware, confrontational scholarship' by a 'skilled, ingenious, brave archaeologist of knowledge' (xi-xii). Those who shy away from such language should however know that it is considerably better, although rather less 'new', than the rhetoric may suggest. Written in – but also critical of – the tradition of Detienne and Derrida, *Sowing the Body* examines the classical images of woman as field/furrow/oven/stone/tablet. These are seen not merely as a static network of metaphors for the female body, but also as a fluid group in which each makes reference to the others, and as a progression over time from field to tablet, shifting as a result of economic change and leading from relative autonomy – in the sphere of images, not necessarily in that of 'reality' – to increased male control.

duBois is, however, certainly 'self-aware', very conscious of her own motives in studying the classical world and of being a woman in a culture which 'privileges those with a penis' (17). One of the best aspects of the book is her general interest in our relationship with the ancient Greeks; the classicist as subject, the effect of the observer on the observed. She rejects both the desire to make the Greek world into a feminist 'paradise lost' (58), and the quest to recover Greeks like ourselves. Her abiding interest is rather in 'the strangeness of the Greeks', the *difference*, yet 'We can read the ancient world only from within our world, our own desire' (26).

duBois's desire is double: to criticise the application of psychoanalytic theory to the ancient Greeks and, as an aspect of this, to show that the (Freudian) representation of gender difference as presence/absence is alien to the earliest Greek metaphors for the female body. Furthermore, she uses these metaphors to show how binary oppositions such as male/female may start by implying separate but equal status, but too readily come to imply hierarchy.

The first sections, in which duBois takes issue with Freud, formalism and Lacan, are extremely hard going, even to one once described in print as 'heavily and explicitly structuralist'. Those who falter at words like 'habitudinization' should however take heart; the author admits to finding Lacan 'maddening' and his prose 'obfuscatory' (14), and her own prose recovers after Chapter One.

The central thesis is that, until Plato, men and women were seen as *different* - almost as separate species rather than possessing/lacking. In terms of misogyny, it may seem to make little real difference whether one regards women as a separate species or as incomplete men, but duBois argues that this should not blind us to the essentially different ways of conceptualising gender which lie behind these representations.

In the beginning was the earth, which can 'produce, give and contain' (41). For duBois, supported by Sappho¹, the image of the female body as earth to be ploughed hints at autonomy, at the earth of Hesiod's age of gold which produced good things spontaneously, unsown and unploughed. Woman as earth thus suggests 'that woman is the parthenogenetic source of life', yet this central metaphor can take on other nuances. In a gathering culture² the earth gives up her gifts spontaneously, but in an agricultural culture she seems to hide or begrudge her gifts. Pandora, made of earth and water, is – like her *pithos* - a container which

¹ An unashamedly personal reading: 'I believe Sappho's poem celebrates the female body as unploughed earth' (27).

² duBois, aware that women's gathering is of more importance to the diet than men's hunting, deliberately avoids the more familiar term, 'hunter-gatherer culture'.

hides the stuff of life. To shift from communally-owned earth to privately-owned field is not just to change modes of production, but also to change attitudes to the female body.

With the shift of focus from the generous and fruitful earth to an earth which must be cultivated, the dominant image becomes the furrow. In the later 5th century duBois suggests that both the need to import cereals and the policy of abandoning Attika to the Spartan troops have the effect of separating the Athenians from the earth.

The metaphor of stone takes us to the other side of earth; virgin, unyielding, but creating in men a desire to work it and shape it. The Caryatids are seen as treasurers of the city, reflecting the image of woman as treasurer both of the household stores and of the male seed. This metaphor is thus seen as encompassing the value of the female body as treasury, while also suggesting unavailability. The image of womb as oven is similarly complex. There is less risk here than in the earth-metaphor of parthenogenesis, since the oven required fuel. duBois possibly plays down some of the complexity, since she regards the womb-oven as naturally cold until supplied with male heat; however, some Hippocratic writers suggest that the female is the hotter sex³. duBois uses a wide range of source material throughout, but above all in her section on woman as tablet. Again, she suggests that economic change underlies the shift in metaphors, this time associated with the role of writing in commercial culture. Like her connections with the rise of agriculture and the emergence of private ownership, this historical development is not easy to date, and it is not clear how quickly a change in ideas is supposed to follow a change in 'reality'. The tablet is seen as totally passive, unable to generate new words, while writing is presented as a way of showing possession and control. Detailed studies of the imagery associated with writing in the *Suppliants* and *Trachiniae* are set beside a discussion of the patterns on geometric vases. As in the earlier metaphor-studies, a series of examples is set out, but the connecting thread is not always clearly marked.

A final section discusses Plato. Although duBois believes that to some extent each of the metaphors attributes a 'different' but nevertheless important role to the female, or hints at a valued aspect of her body, Plato is seen as the villain of the piece. His only use of reproductive metaphors is to appropriate them, so that the (male) philosopher is not only the one who plants the seed, but also the field in which it grows. Aristotle takes this process a stage further, not appropriating the qualities of the female but rather setting them beside those of the male and judging them as defective. Instead of integrating male and female into the male, Aristotle claims that the male is already perfect. Until Plato and Aristotle, the Greeks 'did not see women as castrated' (212): after Plato and Aristotle, women become 'defective, partial men' (187). In being acknowledged as human, they paradoxically lose their value.

'My intention is to provoke' (4); duBois has succeeded.

Copyright © 1989 Helen King



³ E.g. *Mul* 1.1, Littré 8.12; *Mul* 3.217, 8.418; cf. J. Ducatillon, *Polémiques dans la collection hippocratique* (Lille 1977), p.258.